

Chapter	Page #	Comment	Source	Theme	Response - Incorporated into Plan	Response - Not incorporated into Plan
Chapter 1 (pgs 1-18): Vision Plan						
1	9	Vision should include: "including neighborhood retail and retail that attracts shoppers regionally"	Advisory Group	Retail	Added regional retail to vision	
1	9	The vision is well developed	AlexEngage	General Support	NA	
1	11	<p>1. Recommendation 1.3: Mount Jefferson Park Enhancement: "accessibility and improved safety with eyes on the park. It is unclear what this means, but it seems to suggest either video surveillance or improved visibility. If the former, my questions would involve the necessity of such an addition, the destination of any feed(s), under what circumstances it would be used, how long any footage would be retained, what safeguards would be in place to prevent unauthorized access, and who would have authority to view it. If it means anything other than that, some additional clarity in the language would be helpful.</p> <p>2. Recommendation 1.4: I have some reservations about rooftop open spaces; those reservations could be reduced if the open spaces include barriers to prevent noise and light pollution from adversely affecting adjacent homes.</p> <p>3. Recommendation 1.5: I am very much in favor of expanding parks, though elsewhere in the plan, it appears that this may not happen for Ruby Tucker and some of the others for many years.</p>	AlexEngage	Clarification/Roof top Amenity space /Ruby Tucker Park timing	<p>Yes - clarified that eyes on the park means more human activity in park, not surveillance</p> <p>Yes - added language to require rooftop space to reduce light and noise impacts on adjoining res. P 11 and 54 ; added language about Ruby Tucker Park timing to implementation ch. " It is currently projected that the Ruby Tucker Park expansion will happen in the mid- to long- term, however, If and when the redevelopment site adjacent to the park comes in sooner, the City will work with the developer to implement the open space expansion at that time. The Park will be designed in consultation with the community. "</p>	
1	11	<p>1.5 - Expand Ruby Tucker Park - Excellent Idea! This park would also be an ideal spot for a mid-block pedestrian crossing of Route One with a HAWK beacon integrated with the extension of the dedicated ROW of the TransitWay.</p> <p>1.6 "Encourage integration of the area's industrial heritage into new building, park and streetscape design." As a homeowner in Lynhaven, I would rather see emphasis on a romantic notion of American railroad heritage than vague "industrial," which I'm not sure what that means since the site was a superfund site in the 1990s.</p> <p>Chapter One does not mention the planned extension (after a certain development threshold in Potomac Yards Landbay F) of the TransitWay north to run in the median of Route One and then turn on Reed Ave. towards Potomac Avenue.</p> <p>Under Implementation, it would definitely help with the surrounding neighborhood relationship, pedestrian friendliness and place making to do the "Ruby Tucker Park Expansion" sooner. Why the long wait after the Mt. Jefferson park upgrades?</p>	AlexEngage	Ruby Tucker Park timing	<p>Yes: added language about Ruby Tucker Park timing to implementation ch. "It is currently projected that the Ruby Tucker Park expansion will happen in the mid- to long- term; however, if and when the redevelopment site adjacent to the park comes in sooner, the City will work with the developer to implement the open space expansion at that time. The Park will be designed in consultation with the community.";</p> <p>Yes, added "railroad and" to "industrial heritage" pg 12</p>	
1	11	Perhaps provide note in the recommendations that accommodations for visual and sound barriers between the Jeff Park and the future road be made. Maybe even go so far as to recommend that barriers be "natural" in material (dirt, plantings). I understand there will be breaks at the entries, however many residents have requested the sense of tranquility that currently exists in the park be maintained to the greatest extent possible. Examples of sound/visual barriers could include plantings, walls, mounds,etc..	Advisory Group	Park/Accommodations for visual/sound barriers	Berming and landscaping is proposed	
1	12	Page 12 - Perhaps add a note to recommendations to encourage uses that will activate the streetscape and recommend that encroachments be allowed pursuant to Development Special Use Permit approval.	Advisory Group	Streetscape	Added language	
1	12	<p>Leed Certified? Silver?</p> <p>• 1.8 "...25-foot pedestrian areas with street trees where possible</p>	Advisory Group	Green Buildings Streetscape	Added language to introduction (pg 24) - all new development will be required to comply with existing City policies, including Green Building Policy	
1	13	<p>First paragraph: "Have we incorporated sufficient biking specs?"</p> <p>• Transportation Options and Connectivity/Recommendation 1.12 - "The signalized intersections are fairly evenly spaced. Why put any one mid-block over another? Do we need this?"</p>	Advisory Group	Bike facilities Pedestrian Signal	Added language and specs to multiple sections about biking. Revised recommendation about signal to indicate that it can be located between Custis and Glebe - not specifying Fannon.	
1	13	A traffic light at Montrose is unnecessary - I travel this every day and it is rarely backed up with people turning onto U.S. 1. A traffic light will just make US 1 even more backed up in the morning. A bus stop headed into DC at East Glebe is needed with a more inviting walk from Auburn Village to the bus stop.	AlexEngage	Opposed to Montrose Signal		Montrose signal is recommended to add connectivity to the grid and relieve congestion. Also recommended are a new traffic light at Montrose Ashby/Glebe and traffic calming on Montrose

Chapter	Page #	Comment	Source	Theme	Response - Incorporated into Plan	Response - Not incorporated into Plan
1	13	Recommendation 1.11 - I'm not understanding the improvement offered by an additional traffic light at Montrose and Route 1. As a Lynhaven resident, it already takes multiple light cycles just to get onto Route 1 northbound from E Reed during the morning rush hour. Adding another light on the only remaining border of Lynhaven (Montrose) would create an encasement of traffic, preventing residents from even being able to exit their own street. Furthermore, on the other end of Montrose is E Glebe Rd. If you install a light at Montrose and Route 1, this will only encourage more traffic off of E Glebe, and onto Montrose (in order to get to Route 1 faster). I see absolutely no positive outcome of an additional traffic light as proposed in recommendation 1.11.	AlexEngage	Opposed to Montrose Signal		Montrose signal is recommended to add connectivity to the grid and relieve congestion. Also recommended are a new traffic light at Montrose Ashby/Glebe and traffic calming on Montrose
1	13	Recommendation 1.11: The addition of a new traffic signal at Montrose Ave. and Route 1 could increase traffic through the Lynhaven neighborhood while also compounding the problems at the intersection of E. Glebe Rd., Ashby St., and Montrose Ave. That intersection is already challenging to navigate at certain times of day. While I oppose the addition of a new signal at Montrose Ave., if one is added, the Glebe/Ashby/Montrose intersection would need substantial improvements. Recommendation 1.12: It is unclear what signalized pedestrian connection means. If this indicates a pedestrian-only crossing with pedestrian-activated flashing yellow lights, a pedestrian crossing sign, and a crosswalk, I am not convinced it would be sufficient to stop traffic on Route 1. A more substantial crossing, possibly with a stoplight, might be advisable, assuming that Fannon St. is a logical place for such a crossing. Crosswalks in the region often seem to be placed far apart and at streets with little pedestrian traffic, while a large number of pedestrians between (and far from) those crossings must either choose to take a safe, indirect (longer) route or an unsafe (without signal or crosswalk), direct route across. If they have not already, planners should review attractions and residential density on both sides of Route 1 at Fannon St. and other cross streets to determine whether the anticipated volume of pedestrian traffic in those locations would benefit from a crossing.	AlexEngage	Opposed to Montrose Signal		Montrose signal is recommended to add connectivity to the grid and relieve congestion. Also recommended are a new traffic light at Montrose Ashby/Glebe and traffic calming on Montrose . Pedestrian Crossing will be a full traffic signal to stop all traffic. Plan revised to allow flexibility about location of signal between Custis/Glebe based on need determined through analysis.
1	13	New signal at Montrose would only further congest Rt 1 and add cut through traffic on Montrose. There is a signal at Rt1 and the Evans dead end for Potomac Yard. That is less than a full block from Montrose.	AlexEngage			Montrose signal is recommended to add connectivity to the grid and relieve congestion. Also recommended are a new traffic light at Montrose Ashby/Glebe and traffic calming on Montrose .
1	15/16	Recommendation 1.16: "Does this say enough? One person's diverse is another's monstrous"	Advisory Group		Yes, revised Chapter 1 language on affordable housing	
1	15	Recommendation 1.2: "Not same as on page 10" • Recommendation 1.4: Not same as on page 11" • Recommendation 1.8: "Not same as on page 12" • Recommendation 1.12: "Is this really needed?" • Recommendation 1.16: "Does this say enough?"	Advisory Group	Non-substantive edit	Addressed	
1	15	Recommendation 1.11: I would like to see a requirement that before the street light at Montrose Avenue and Route 1 is installed that a plan for fixing the stretch of Montrose from Route 1 to the East Glebe/Ashby intersection is approved. Adding the light at Montrose and Route 1 will increase traffic on this stretch and a solution to the challenges this will bring needs to be developed prior to the light being installed. I believe the solution should include a stop sign at Evans or Wesmond and improvements to the Montrose/East Glebe/Ashby intersection that is already a mess.	Advisory Group	Montrose Signal - Need associated improvements		Montrose signal is recommended to add connectivity to the grid and relieve congestion. Also recommended are a new traffic light at Montrose Ashby/Glebe and traffic calming on Montrose .
1	15	Should we add a requirement for bike/ped connection between Stewart and Swann	Advisory Group	Bike/Ped Facilities	Added p15 and elsewhere	
1	16	Topic "Allocation of Funding for Plan Implementation." The Ruby Tucker Park expansion has minimal funds allocated. Additional funds should be provided to not only expand Ruby Tucker Park, but also improve it with a modern playground and a safe/sustainable fence to allow children to play and congregate. In addition, a large amount of funds is set up for on-site affordable housing. Oakville Triangle should focus on retail and affordable housing should be part of the larger Potomac Yard development.	AlexEngage	Ruby Tucker Park timing and funding	Yes: added language about Ruby Tucker Park timing to implementation ch. "It is currently projected that the Ruby Tucker Park expansion will happen in the mid- to long- term; however, if and when the redevelopment site adjacent to the park comes in sooner, the City will work with the developer to implement the open space expansion at that time. The Park will be designed in consultation with the community."	
1	16	Please provide approximate \$ amounts of the pie. This does not necessarily have to make it into the guidelines, but I think it would be good for discussion purposes to understand.	Advisory Group	Graphics	This graphic has been removed. Additional information will be provided and incorporated as part of the zoning approvals.	
1	16	Page 16 – The pie chart representing costs should reflect a percentage or value.	AlexEngage	Graphics	The chart has been removed from the Vision Plan; text addresses implementation of the Plan.	
1	17	Typical Redevelopment Conditions: Add to 2nd bullet: "publicly accessible" • Developer Contributions: provide examples of "improvements not typically required as part of the Development Special Use Permit process"	Advisory Group		Re: Developer Cont: included in plan	Not all open space is publicly accessible

Chapter	Page #	Comment	Source	Theme	Response - Incorporated into Plan	Response - Not incorporated into Plan
1	17	<p>Page 17 – Section 2: “...the City anticipates that a portion of the value increase ... will come back to the City in the form of developer contributions to fund ... not typically required as part of the design process. Anticipates – means not sure. Not typical – What makes the developer change tactics if there is no precedent? How can the City be sure? Where will the money come from if not the developer?</p> <p>Your proposal also introduces “a new real estate tax revenue plan”. Is this the same real estate tax plan discussed by City Council a few years ago when Potomac Yard was being developed? Is this the plan that would have residents of Potomac Yard paying a higher tax rate than those of who live in the 60-70 year old homes? Will there be variable tax rates all over the City of Alexandria according to the area wherein we live? Will the residents have a voice in this matter?</p>	AlexEngage	Developer Contributions	The developer contributions will be provided as part of the redevelopment. The tax referenced in the Plan is not a special tax district. The Plan is proposing to use a portion of the incremental value as a result of the Plan.	
1	18	<p>“Public Benefits Phasing.” The Ruby Tucker Park expansion should be moved upfront to the 0-5 years section of phasing and funds should be allocated initially to the expansion and improvement of Ruby Tucker Park rather than relying on future tax revenue.</p>	AlexEngage	Ruby Tucker Park timing	Yes: added language about Ruby Tucker Park timing to implementation ch. "It is currently projected that the Ruby Tucker Park expansion will happen in the mid- to long- term; however, if and when the redevelopment site adjacent to the park comes in sooner, the City will work with the developer to implement the open space expansion at that time. The Park will be designed in consultation with the community."	
1	18	<p>“Plan could take 20 years to implement.” Every year costs/rates increase, new products are developed and or manufactured, and various styles of construction become the “in” thing.</p> <p>The plan states: “for a 20-30 year vision.” What happened to the vision that was created for Potomac Yard in 2000? A lot of citizens attended meetings concerning the original design of Potomac Yard. Will this 20-30 year vision be effective in 5 years, 10 years, etc.?</p>	AlexEngage	Implementation		The Plan establishes as broad vision given the long-term nature of the Plan, but also permits flexibility to respond to changing conditions over a period of time.
1	General	<p>The first principle articulated in the plan is "neighborhood compatibility." But the plan itself is only compatible with Route 1, not Del Ray. There is no stand alone housing envisioned, and the housing that is included is extremely high density, which fits with the "pack 'em in" approach taken with the former rail yards. That being the case, attempts to tie Oakville to Del Ray should be abandoned. You haven't bothered to make the development "compatible" with Del Ray, so leave us out of it.</p> <p>The third principle is "improved and expanded open spaces." While the plan does appear to make improvements to Mount Jefferson park, the rest of the "open space" is tiny and, more often than not, illusory. The concept of "roof top open space" is wholly insulting and anyone attempting to get credit for it should be laughed out of the room.</p>	AlexEngage			<p>The intent of the Plan's recommendations for new development to be compatible to existing neighborhoods is not that the new development be "the same as" but to provide appropriate transition and a buffer between the old and the new. The standards require these appropriate transitions.</p> <p>In addition to the 3 acre improved Mt Jefferson Park, the City also recommends expansion to Ruby Tucker Park, several additional ground level open spaces in Oakville Triangle, required ground level open space with all new redevelopment. Rooftop amenity space provides outdoor recreation space for new residents, similar to the function of a backyard for single family homes.</p>
1	General	<p>OVERALL PLAN COMMENTS</p> <p>To me, the plan is much too heavy on residential development. Most of the recommended retail development is located in the Oakville development. Maker spaces and or retail in other areas appear to only be allowed on the ground floor of designated residential use blocks. Retail and maker spaces require customer parking, loading facilities, designated space for trash and recycling. Sharing of this limited space with residents is unrealistic for a retail establishment to thrive. The arrangement is impossible for light industrial/commercial use (makers). I would recommend less emphasis on residential and more on unique service and retail development.</p> <p>CDD ZONING</p> <p>I am unclear what exactly CDD zoning means. Page 87 states that the specific requirements for the type of uses and associated requirements will be established as part of the CDD zoning for the plan area. Will there be rezoning within the CDD area that hasn't been designated yet but will when the plan is submitted or when blocks come up before the planning commission for redevelopment?</p>	AlexEngage	Retail/Maker Space		<p>The Plan attempts to balance a mix of uses within the plan area by permitting a mix of office, hotel and residential uses.</p> <p>The CDD zoning will designate uses for each block within the Plan area.</p>
1	General	<p>I am glad the park is being opened up and that there will be affordable housing. I am concerned that bicycling is relegated to the park and not really part of the transportation plan.</p>	AlexEngage	Bicycle facilities	Additional information about recommended bike facility improvements has been added to several sections, including chapter 1 and the Framework Plan. In addition to the bike access across Mount Jefferson Park, there are also bike facilities on Swann Avenue and on E Glebe Road, recommended locations for Capital Bikeshare, and bike storage.	
1	General	<p>Would like more focus on retail. The neighborhood is very heavily residential and having more residential (townhomes) in district 1 along RTE 1 seems like a poor use of the traffic RTE 1 provides. I would much rather see district 1 as retail instead of residential.</p>	AlexEngage	Retail		<p>There is a limit to the amount and location where retail can be provided to be successful. The retail has been concentrated and connected to make it more viable. Maker space/commercial use is located within the ground floor on Route 1.</p>

Chapter	Page #	Comment	Source	Theme	Response - Incorporated into Plan	Response - Not incorporated into Plan
1	General	I'd put more emphasis on how the ground floor spaces should be used. Maker spaces and retail are not always the same thing. Maker spaces can include bakery's, clothing makers, arts, light industrial and related uses. There should be an explicit expectation that ground floor uses are either maker, industrial kitchens, light industrial or retail and one of the recommendations should be for the city to create retail/maker space design guidelines that ensure the spaces are designed to accommodate a wide range of these creative uses and also that the upper story residential uses will be designed to mitigate and prevent conflicts with noise, smells, etc.	AlexEngage	Maker Space		The issue of requirements for commercial space is addressed in the Design Standards. The future zoning will specify which uses can be located within the retail-maker space.
1	General	Should not have the Ruby Tucker Park expansion be in 12 to 16 years. It's not even that expensive according to your chart of costs. General design of big blockish buildings very similar to other infill which has already created a glut of this type.	AlexEngage	Ruby Tucker Park timing	Yes: added language about Ruby Tucker Park timing to implementation ch. ". It is currently projected that the Ruby Tucker Park expansion will happen in the mid- to long- term, however, If and when the redevelopment site adjacent to the park comes in sooner, the City will work with the developer to implement the open space expansion at that time. The Park will be designed in consultation with the community. "; Yes, added "railroad and" to "industrial heritage"	
1	General	My concern is about how it will affect the residential neighborhoods. I don't want more traffic in my neighborhood. One reason we bought our home is location of the Lynhaven neighborhood. We like having a neighborhood near commercial development, we also get the charm of the neighborhood. The Wesmond street and Lyn haven being dead-end streets gives it a neighborhood feel. It would ruin the neighborhood if you opened up the street to route one. The increase the traffic would take away the safety of our cul de sac. You can have the development without changing the inner neighborhood feel.	AlexEngage	Transportation		The Plan does not provide a recommendation to open Wesmond Drive, Evans Lane, or Lynhaven Drive. The map/graphic has been refined/corrected to show that these streets will remain in their existing conditions.
1	General	General comments - a person should read and compile the comments rather than having a computer do it. If there are just going to be parking garages - I will not take my business there - but I will order things over the internet. Wondering who you are building this for - not for me - it does not look like a place I will go to.	AlexEngage	Parking		New development will be home to new residents and will also include retail/maker space (with ground floor parking) for new and existing residents. The use of structured parking is comparable to other retail areas in the region.
1	General	Generally, I'm okay with the vision -- but it lacks depth. There is little evidence of the study of traffic flow. This is critically important but usually left out. I've made more specific comments under the "streets" section. Impacts to infrastructure - such as schools (which are overcrowding now) would also benefit from an impact study. Thank you.	AlexEngage	Vision, Transportation, Infrastructure	Yes, added brief summary of the findings of the traffic study, and the full study will be in the appendix.	The impacts to schools has been examined as part of the Plan. We are coordinated with ACPS staff on future school needs through the Long Range Educational Facilities Plan (which can be found online).
1	General	You mention the need to integrate the industrial heritage of the area, but give no specific suggestions. The back sides of the buildings at the south end of Zone 2 (the sides formerly facing the tracks, now the park) are really cool and the only part that really reflects the older uses, from the 1940s. But I see from the diagrams that they are to be torn down. Surely something can be left there. If not, will the owner at least thoroughly document the buildings before demolishing them?	AlexEngage	Industrial Heritage		The standards recommend that industrial heritage be reflected in new architecture, but how that happens will be reviewed during the development process. Interpretive signage about the site's industrial heritage will be included as part of the park improvements. While the buildings themselves will not be retained, their architectural style will be incorporated into the new development.
1	General	I'm okay with the vision. I like the idea of including makers as part of the vision. 1.11 A signal at Montrose is dubious at best. Montrose is too narrow to work as a connector. Those headed north need to be diverted onto Commonwealth so that they can take Reed to Rt. 1. 1.12 It is unclear what benefit the pedestrian crossing at Fannon serves. Where is anyone going that couldn't be handled by the existing pedestrian crossings at Custis and Swann? There is nothing but residences on the other side of Rt. 1 - no need to cross there. 1.13 The proposed improvements at E. Glebe aren't going to work. See more details in section 8.	AlexEngage	Vision, Opposed to Montrose signal, Fannon crossing,	Plan revised to allow flexibility about location of a pedestrian signal between Custis/Glebe.	The signal at Montrose is recommended to increase connectivity for the neighborhoods. The planned improvements at the intersection of Route 1 and Glebe Road were developed as part of the comprehensive traffic study and will improve the circulation at this intersection.
1	General	First, let me state that I am not against change and I do understand that you cannot please everyone. However, I also know that all change is not good. One of my main concerns is that this proposal package is too large/voluminous and wordy (127 pages) to be understood by the senior populace of the community that is being greatly affected. I would like to see only one section of the proposal explained thoroughly in each future meeting. Thus, all future meetings will deal with only one section of the proposal at a time. The compatibility with existing neighborhoods is mentioned several times throughout the proposal. However, before the creation of Potomac Yard, Preston Condominiums and Potomac Reserves, excluding Crystal City, there weren't any high rise buildings along Jefferson Davis Highway (Rt. 1). Since 2000 it seems that the construction of high rise buildings are taking over all of Alexandria. High rise buildings are not necessarily compatible with the pre-existing homes that are nearly 60-70 years old. I don't understand your vision of compatibility. Identifiable characteristics of adjacent neighborhoods is also mentioned throughout the proposal. Identifiable characteristics of pre-existing old neighborhoods are being destroyed.	AlexEngage	Neighborhood compatibility		The length of the Plan was an attempt to balance all of the needs and requirements of the plan area. The building height and scale steps down to the existing neighborhoods to the west. The intent of the Plan's recommendations for new development to be compatible to existing neighborhoods is not that the new development be "the same as" but to provide appropriate transition and a buffer between the old and the new. The standards require these appropriate transitions.
Chapter 2 (pgs 20-22): DG						

Chapter	Page #	Comment	Source	Theme	Response - Incorporated into Plan	Response - Not incorporated into Plan
2	21	Shade existing open space with a different color and add to legend	Advisory Group	Open space	Addressed (graphic is illustrative)	
2	22	General Standards 2.1 Taller? Shorter? Greater? Lesser? 2.2 "...below grade and provide a 25ft setback-streetscape for the buildings adjacent to Route 1 where possible" • Under Open Space, Reference roof top open space again?	Advisory Group	Non-substantive edit	2.1 language has been clarified	The references under space are for new public open spaces. Rooftop amenities are addressed in Chapter 4 (page 57 of the revised draft).
2	22	Recommendation 2.1: I'm not clear what this means. Is it simply a restatement of recommendation 1.9 that higher heights should be allowed near transit stops? Or does it have some other meaning?	Advisory Group	Non-substantive edit	Revised	
2	22	2.1: What is meant by "Provide building height adjacent to transit stops..."? Considerable building height? Taller than average building height?	Advisory Group	Non-substantive edit	Revised	
2	22	Recommendation 2.10 and 2.12: New streets should include safe, separate space/lanes for bicycle traffic, rather than theoretical lanes that require cyclists to use the same space as vehicle traffic. This is an opportunity to build in infrastructure that would encourage bicycle use and reduced residents' reliance on single-occupant vehicles.	AlexEngage	Bicycle facilities	Additional information about recommended bike facility improvements has been added to several sections, including chapter 1 and the Framework Plan. In addition to the bike access across Mount Jefferson Park, there are also bike facilities on Swann Avenue and on E Glebe Road, recommended locations for Capital Bikeshare, and bike storage.	
2	General	Looks good.	AlexEngage	General Support	NA	
2	General	See above. More detail needed about retail and maker space design elements and more explicit statements about the types of uses that are encouraged and should be accommodated with building design.	AlexEngage	Retail, Maker Space	More detail has been incorporated, but specifics will be delineated in CDD zoning.	
2	General	Having a 25 ft street scape which doesn't include a real bike lane for route 1. Route 1 so congested it would be vey unsafe for bikes. And since congestion will only be getting worse bikes need safe space. Having bikes share Mt. Jeff, may create a hazard to pedestrians.	AlexEngage	Bicycle facilities		The Plan is not recommending Route 1 for bike travel. It recommends Swann and Glebe for dedicated lanes East/West, and N/S will be accommodated on non-arterials, which has slower traffic and is less congested.
2	General	Well developed	AlexEngage	General Support	NA	
Chapter 3 (pgs 24-35): Districts						
3	25	Include potential maker space!	Advisory Group	Maker Space	Added language in District 1	
3	25	Callout vet's office as "Existing zoning to remain."?	Advisory Group	Non-substantive edit	Graphic clarified	
3	25	Several residents have raised issues to me regarding the "flat" architectural facades that line Route 1 on the Potomac Yard side. Perhaps add a note that any time Townhomes front on Route 1, provisions for variation in materials, colors, heights and setbacks be made to help avoid that flat look. Define how the 25' streetscape is broken down (10' landscape strip, 10'sidewalk, 5' landscape strip, or whatever)	Advisory Group	Architecture/character/Street scape	Additional language has been added under 5.22 "...shifts in the footprint shall be a minimum of 2-5 feet to provide varieties in the footprint." Streetscape: addressed in street cross-section	
3	27	I found this confusing as District 1 does not have any of Mt. Jefferson Park in it. Maybe these park graphics should move to District 2.	Advisory Group	Non-substantive edit	Revised	
3	27	Add a note that defines the access points shown as being the only ones allowed. Perhaps label on the graphic at the bottom of the page that access points are limited to only those shown here.	Advisory Group	Park Access	Access points are addressed on the pedestrian map.	
3	28	Add to two bottom boxes "Provide ADA compliant access to Park"	Advisory Group	Accessibility	The entrance to the park closest to Route 1 will not be ADA compliant; however the Raymond Ave. entrance will be.	
3	28	The heights for the townhouses on Park Road (35-45ft) listed don't align with minimum in the figures later in the document which is listed as 30ft. ☐	Advisory Group	Building heights	Revised	
3	28	Let's talk about bike facilities for Swann avenue.	Advisory Group	Bicycle facilities	Now shown in graphic and plan	
3	28	Mount Jefferson Part should be a dog exercise area. The residents currently use is as such and change in the layout to have a small exercise area for dogs near Raymond aver would make the area less friendly to how it's currently used in the neighborhood. I'd prefer to see a dog friendly park like the Shirlington Dog Park.	AlexEngage	Dog park	The concept plan for the park went through a community planning process to identify priorities and overall concept.	

Chapter	Page #	Comment	Source	Theme	Response - Incorporated into Plan	Response - Not incorporated into Plan
3	28	(This applies throughout document) Make all references to open space "Minimum" instead of providing the plus/minus sign in front of them. I would also be interested to see in a scalable fashion, what the square footage being committed to actually looks like in plan view. For instance, where the graphic notes 13,500 sq ft of open space, show on the graphic an outline of that amount of square footage in a different color. The graphic shows the streetscape, sidewalks, extra space for flexibility, etc...and it is difficult to know exactly how much private land is being set aside for open space. It can be difficult to understand how much 13,500 square feet equates to and I think the picture is slightly misleading as currently shown since it artificially makes the space look larger with the addition of the adjacent streetscape and "fluff" area. I am not suggesting changing the amount of open space, just clarifying graphically how much the citizens are getting.	Advisory Group	Clarification		Plus/minus is used because the numbers are approximate and not based on survey data.
3	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•Add maker space• First paragraph – include examples of existing types of uses	Advisory Group	Maker Space	Revised	
3	30	The heights for the taller multifamily buildings along Route 1 need to be updated to the correct numbers; The district 3 description would benefit from a discussion about the location of loading docks/how deliveries will be made to businesses. This has come up multiple times in the discussion and would be good to mention here	Advisory Group	Building heights	yes, heights revised; Added standard that location of loading docks be addressed in the development review process	
3	30	"District 3". Much of District 3 currently serves as retail. Some of the District should remain retail. In addition, permanent trash cans similar to the trash cans in Del Ray and Old Town should be established throughout the area to collect trash coming from District 2 retail into the Lynhaven neighborhood.	AlexEngage	Retail	District 3 includes secondary retail Trash cans: Standard added to Urban Design Chapter and will be required through Development Special Use Permit process	
3	33	Page 33, "District 4." This area currently serves the neighborhood with retail services. It should be maintained for retail to continue servicing Lynhaven and other local neighborhoods, not converted to additional housing.	AlexEngage	Retail		Flexible ground floor space for maker uses is recommended along the Route 1 frontage in District 4.
3	34	Indicate what A, B, C, D, E are showing	Advisory Group	Non-substantive edit	Revised	
3	34	Identify A, B, C, D and E on Scale Transitions map	Advisory Group	Non-substantive edit	Revised	
3	34	On page 34, the proposed park seems to be surrounded by a neighborhood unlike the present day neighborhood. It appears that the alley parking was removed. Today, the upkeep of the park is taken care of by Preston Condominiums and LCA. Is the City of Alexandria proposing to take care of the park after the expansion? I can only hope that they will take care of the park and the median strips along Rt. 1 in the future better than they do today.	AlexEngage			The Plan does not recommend removal of the existing parking. The future design will be in coordination with the community. The future maintenance will be determined when the park is developed.
3	35	"...heights ranging from 45ft to 100ft at Swann" (i.e., limited location)	Advisory Group	Building heights	Addressed	
3	35	Should be made clear that this applies to all districts. Maybe move the beginning of "Plan Districts" chapter, or place in "Plan Framework" chapter next to "F. Building Heights" pages.	Advisory Group	Clarification	Clarified in text	
3	35	This graphic makes it look like a lot of tall buildings right on Rt. 1 with no step backs and no articulation.	AlexEngage	Graphics		Graphics are illustrative, but limited in what they can show. Standards require stepbacks, articulation, building breaks, etc.
3	35	While not necessarily a Route 1 Frontage comment, but how will underground utilities for future transformer and switch equipment be handled for the future blocks? Will the City allow underground vaults within the right-of-way and possibly under the sidewalk? If so, how will that affect the treescape along each street? Tyson's Corner is currently going through some very difficult discussions right now since when the plan was originally created, very little thought was given to the sometimes 80'x25' vaults that are needed to store underground electrical equipment. Provisions for the placement of that equipment should be discussed at this level since they could significantly affect building footprints if required to be placed on site and accommodate DVP's stringent horizontal and vertical clearances.	Advisory Group	Underground utilities	Language has been added to street cross-section	
3	General	Maker space should be a district	Advisory Group	Maker Space		The Plan recommends that maker space be incorporated in designated places in multiple districts.
3	General	In district 3 the heights are way too high - it is looking extremely similar to Crystal City and not a true neighborhood feel that Del Ray is known for. These new buildings will tower over the existing homes and will take away the charm. These buildings should be limited to 3-5 stories and nothing like what is currently being developed across Jefferson Davis.	AlexEngage	Building heights		Proposed heights were carefully considered, discussed, and agreed to over many months. All redevelopment projects will be required to provide specified transitions, setbacks and stepbacks in order to ensure compatibility with existing neighborhoods. Also, the heights in Districts 3 and 4 were corrected - they were shown higher in the working draft than they should have been.

Chapter	Page #	Comment	Source	Theme	Response - Incorporated into Plan	Response - Not incorporated into Plan
3	General	<p>PLAN PRINCIPALS vs DISTRICT PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS</p> <p>PGE 14 Mix of uses, Retail and Maker Spaces. The description in this section acknowledges that Oakville Triangle and the Route 1 Corridor are home to many neighborhood-serving businesses. It states that the plan encourages the inclusion of space within area to locate these important quality of life uses and claims that designated blocks of the plan area will include first floor retail/maker spaces to encourage these uses. Figure 24 illustrates where these designated blocks are. There is a huge disconnect between these two pages and the recommendations for redevelopment within these areas. For example the plan recommends townhouses for District 1 (pg. 25); multifamily buildings for the Route 1 portion of District 3 (PG. 30). District 4 (PG. 33) recommendations are for townhouses and multifamily buildings. All these locations have designated ground floor retail/ maker spaces on figure 24 (PG 44) but the vision plan reads like all area development outside of the Oakville Triangle should be residential except for a lone office building at the corner of E Glebe.</p> <p>In addition, it is stated that the districts are intended to appear and function as extensions of the adjoining unique neighborhoods of Del Ray and Lynhaven (and Potomac Yard although I don't consider this adjoining). However, the envisioned illustrations for these new townhouses and multifamily buildings don't look anything like or seem to fit in with the single family homes and town houses they abut to in the west.</p>	AlexEngage	Maker Space; Compatibility to existing neighborhoods	Revised; also added language regarding maker spaces to relevant pages throughout the Plan.	Compatibility: The goal is that the new development will be compatible to existing neighborhoods, not necessarily the same. In order to address differences in scale, new development is required to provide adequate stepdowns, stepbacks, and buffers.
3	General	<p>Pages 30-31, District 3: The intersection between the new north-south Road and the existing Glebe Road could become highly active. The Plan is unclear about how traffic would be handled at this intersection; planners and developers should consider the amount and types of traffic likely to traverse this intersection and implement sufficient signs and/or signals to moderate it. The north-south Road could also add to the challenges at the Glebe/Ashby/Montrose intersection, reinforcing the need for complementary improvements to that intersection.</p> <p>Page 33, District 4: The Plan states that District 4 is similar to District #1 with shallow lots/blocks and existing townhouses immediately to the west. However, while in District 1 this was managed by recommending only townhouses, for District 4 the Plan recommends substantial multi-family units. It could reasonably be argued that District 4, with its similarity to District 1, should also permit only townhouses, or at least a greater proportion of townhouses than recommended in the current Plan. Even Districts 2 and 3 make greater use of townhouses as a scale transition to the existing neighborhoods, while in District 4, the scale transition is feebly achieved through slightly reduced height to a fraction of the depth of the buildings west-facing sides. This will do little to reduce the impact on the neighborhood of the imposing, wide expanse and height of those enormous buildings, not to mention the impact on parking (already an issue in District 4) and traffic.</p> <p>Regardless of the dwelling types ultimately built in District 4, steps also need to be taken to shield the existing neighborhood from the impact of garbage, traffic, parking, and other undesirable activities that are likely to occur at the rear of the buildings. The ground level open space for District 4 does not appear sufficient to meet General Standards 4.19 or 4.20 (p. 56).</p> <p>I strongly oppose the number and size of multi-family dwellings proposed for District 4 and recommend that the proposed multi-family dwellings be replaced in part or entirely with townhouses comparable to those recommended for District 1. The Chapter 3 introduction on page 24 states that the districts identified in the Plan are intended to appear and function as extensions of the adjoining unique neighborhoods. ¶The multi-family buildings that appear in the Plan for District 4 in no way reflect the character or composition of the adjoining neighborhood, nor do they appear or function as extensions ¶of it.</p>	AlexEngage	Transportation; Compatibility to existing neighborhoods	<p>(pg 30-31): Revised graphic on page 30 and added text to page 31 to address future new intersection</p> <p>(pg 33): Revised text to better clarify. Multi-family buildings are medium not large scale in District 4 (includes deeper parcels). All require height/scale transitions. Parking will be required onsite underground.</p>	<p>(pg 56): The Plan is illustrative, not to scale, Development Special Use Permits will require projects meet all standards including open space and parking, as well as requirements for screening trash and addressing loading.</p> <p>Multi-family in District 4: This location is the most appropriate for higher density due to its proximity to the planned metro.</p>
3	General	Buildings are not compatible with local neighborhood. No one wants a building 15 ft taller than their house blocking the sun.	AlexEngage	Heights		The intent of the Plan's recommendations for new development to be compatible to existing neighborhoods is not that the new development be "the same as" but to provide appropriate transition and a buffer between the old and the new. The standards require these appropriate transitions.
3	General	Please do not force out successful businesses that are used by the community to replace them with townhouses. I am appalled to see Del Ray Animal Hospital in the area slated for town houses. It is wonderful having access to our vet's office without having to drive through traffic, or having to park in an underground garage - it would be sinful if they are forced out. They are a successful business that is an asset to the community.	AlexEngage	Existing business; Del Ray Animal Hospital		Existing zoning for this parcel will remain; no business will be forced to leave and may remain until they wish to sell or redevelop.
3	General	see above comments on Chapter 1 for Zone 2.	AlexEngage			
3	General	<p>District 1. Please no more townhouses overlooking Rt. 1. This is a terrible idea. The townhouses should align to the east-west roads (Howell, Windsor, and Custis. The stretch along the highway should be maker space with a rear alley for access to parking (garage). Having a healthy mix of commercial and residential will keep the area vibrant.</p> <p>District 2 -</p> <p>Great neighborhoods need great streets. What is the great street in Oakville Triangle? Don't tell me Swann Ave. The only reasonable option is Oakville St. / north-south Rd. It needs to be walkable and bikeable.</p> <p>How about putting the hotel in the south corner of the triangle? Hotels are one of the few types of buildings that can use awkwardly shaped space effectively. Let that be the gateway/anchor to the triangle, not a gas station. Putting a hotel smack in the middle of the development is a lousy idea because it breaks up the flow of the otherwise nice street.</p> <p>District 3: The tiny plots of green space aren't going to be very useful. It would be better to shrink the building north of Glebe and allow for a larger plot of green space there.</p> <p>District 4: N/C</p>	AlexEngage	Townhouse orientation		<p>District 1 includes very shallow parcels that are very close to existing residential, both of which limit building size and type. The plan area also includes a mix of building types multi-family/townhouses/office/hotel.</p> <p>District 2/3 will include a new north-south road (continuation of Oakville Street in District 2) connecting Calvert Street to Glebe Road as part of the redevelopment. In addition, all of the streets are to be urban pedestrian scale streets and each street will have a unique character. Bike lanes are not proposed along the north-south road because the planned north-south bicycle route within this vicinity is along the trail adjacent Potomac Ave., which provides a better, more continuous facility.</p> <p>District 3: The open spaces depicted in the Plan are illustrative. New multifamily buildings will be required to provide 25% at grade and 15% on rooftop.</p>
Chapter 4 (pgs 38-60): Framework						

Chapter	Page #	Comment	Source	Theme	Response - Incorporated into Plan	Response - Not incorporated into Plan
4	39	<p>On pages 39 and 40, Wesmond Dr. and Evans Ln., which are currently dead-end streets, appear to be opened and designated streets. Opening those two streets would be extremely detrimental to the existing neighborhood by drawing traffic from the new dwellings and Route 1 onto streets that are not built to handle it. Considering the size of those streets and the volume of traffic they can reasonably handle, opening them to Route 1 would provide minimal benefit, if any.</p> <p>Evans Ln., Wesmond Dr., Montrose Ave., and Lynhaven Dr., which would all see greater traffic if Wesmond and Evans were opened, are narrow residential streets; depending on vehicle sizes and the parking situation, some are incapable of handling more than one vehicle at a time in a single direction. Adding traffic to those streets is not a viable option. For through streets, better alternatives, such as E. Glebe Rd. and E. Reed Ave., already exist.</p> <p>If vehicle entrances to the Route 1 dwellings must be placed off Route 1, an alternative would be a service road that dead-ends but does not connect to Wesmond Dr. or Evans Ln. or a mid-block entrance, possibly with dedicated turn lane, facing Route 1. If these are not possible due to General Standards 4.4 (Streets) and 4.5 (Streets), steps should be taken to minimize through traffic on Wesmond Dr. and Evans Ln.</p> <p>Depending on how it is developed, public open space can be made to look as though it belongs to a private community, which can make members of the community less likely to use and enjoy it. On pages 52-53, the open space on Swann Ave. that connects to Mount Jefferson Park appears partially enclosed by the buildings around it. If this is intended to be public open space, the landscaping, signage, and surrounding building architecture should make it obvious to everyone that it is. In the current plan, it is unclear.</p>	AlexEngage	Lynhaven traffic; Open space		<p>Pages 39 and 40 : The Plan does not provide a recommendation to open Wesmond Drive, Evans Lane, or Lynhaven Drive. The map/graphic has been refined/corrected to show that these streets will remain in their existing condition.</p> <p>General Standards 4.4 and 4.5: Access to parcels will be addressed through the development process.</p> <p>Pages 52-53: The intent for this open space is to be an active public plaza for visitors and residents alike to enjoy. We will revise the graphic to better illustrate the intent.</p>
4	40	Is Park Road really and "A" street?	Advisory Group	Park Road	Park Road is designated an A street to preclude curb cuts and preserve the pedestrian character of the street adjacent to the Park.	
4	41	Can Bike and Ped Network be moved up to follow the Street Hierarchy page?	Advisory Group	Non-substantive edit	This will be addressed as part of the final version.	
4	41	General Recommendations 4.5iii, add language that "curb cuts should be to the best extent possible aligned with curb cuts on the opposite side of the street".	Advisory Group	Clarification	Added	
4	44	Not sure I understand what is meant by "active uses" because this includes all the different types of uses we have, nothing is excluded here.	Advisory Group	Clarification	Added clarification	
4	45	Add "Senior Assisted Living Facility" to legend	Advisory Group	Land Use; Senior Assisted Living		To be discussed during Advisory Group meeting
4	46	4.11: add "Canopy lighting shall be down directed or reflected"	Advisory Group	Lighting impacts	Added	
4	46	Fueling/Charging Stations - As a homeowner in the area, we could absolutely lose the fueling stations in the plan area with minimal inconvenience to Alexandria residents and electric charging stations could more easily be built into garages or part of retail spaces. The gas stations on Route One mainly benefit commuters driving through Alexandria.		Fueling/Charging Stations		The Plan does not require the construction of gas stations or fueling areas, but permits the uses. If the uses are provided, they will need to be integrated with new development.
4	48	Max height discrepancies – especially on Lynhaven – should be 45’ not 55’	Advisory Group	Building heights/Correction	Plan text corrected	
4	48	Still think these heights should require Special Use Permit (re: 100’ and 90’)	Advisory Group	Building heights	All of the proposed buildings will require an Special Use Permit within the CDD zoning.	
4	48	Pg 48-49: The maximum heights need to be corrected to align with Advisory Group discussions. There are multiple places where the heights are higher than what was previously agreed to. ☒	Advisory Group	Building heights/Correction	Plan text corrected	
4	48	What is the definition of "building height?" - Does it include rooftop infrastructure like HVAC or rooftop amenities like a canopy for a pool?	AlexEngage	Building heights definition		Please refer to Sec. 2-154 of the City's Zoning Ordinance for the complete definition (https://www.municode.com/library/#!/va/alexandria/codes/zoning): The definition does not include rooftop amenities, but does regulate.
4	52	<p>3rd bullet: At 6sq ft/person potentially 3500 people at an event?</p> <p>• Re: all bullets: Explain better. Is this in addition to earlier open spaces? Does it include setbacks?</p>	Advisory Group	Open space		
4	52	<p>Add language that discourages the placement of surface BMP's within required open space so that the usable area is maximized.</p> <p>- I think the middle bulleted point on the right side of the page is missing "For Multifamily developments...."</p> <p>- Reinforce the amount of open space by again showing the square footage required and real, graphic representation of that amount of area. (See comment from Page 28).</p>	Advisory Group	Clarification	<p>Added language as part of 4.22;</p> <p>Open space comment addressed</p>	
4	53	What about bike parking facilities in that plaza?	Advisory Group	Bicycle facilities	Detail will be included as part of the design of the plaza and Development Special Use Permit process.	
4	54	Add ADA Compliant Access to Park	Advisory Group	Accessibility	Added	
4	55	<p>Standards: General or specific?</p> <p>• 4.21: Why not required?</p> <p>• 4.28: Is such equipment being required in any of the new open spaces?</p>	Advisory Group	Rooftop amenity space	Language has been added to strongly encourage	

Chapter	Page #	Comment	Source	Theme	Response - Incorporated into Plan	Response - Not incorporated into Plan
4	56	While the text on pg 55 includes this I would also like to see the standards in this section include similar language "The rooftop open space on buildings in close proximity to the adjoining neighborhoods will need to be designed in a manner compatible with the character of the adjoining residential neighborhoods."	Advisory Group	Rooftop Amenity Space	Added	
4	56	I don't see any outdoor play areas or playgrounds anywhere in the plan. 4.22 seems kind of redundant.	Advisory Group	Outdoor play area	Added language re a variety of users and ages. 4.28 addresses need but will be determined in the Development Special Use Permit	
4	56	4.16 No hardscape plaza, that creates stormwater problems, urban heat island and poor for recreation. There is no reason that concerts or lunch eating needs lots of hardscape. Item 4.27 allowing concrete with just grooves terrible for stormwater and not a high quality finish. 4.28 define play areas. No min. height, p 50, if you don't want townhouses that can be controlled by zoning.	AlexEngage	Swann Ped Plaza		The central plaza design is still being developed and will be discussed as part of the Development Special Use Permit process. The minimum heights are not intended to prevent townhouses, but to address the urban design goals of the Plan.
4	56	Add the following recommendations <ul style="list-style-type: none">- No surface BMP's in open space- Provide total square footage for all 4 open space areas (so number is set, location may shift)- Limit access to Jeff park to those shown on the graphic	Advisory Group	Clarification	Addressed	
4	57	Gateway to maker street? I thought there were to be maker spaces on Calvert	Advisory Group	Gateway/Maker on Calvert	Maker added to area of existing warehouses on Calvert; gateways are limited to key locations	
4	57	Pgs 57-58: Do the standards included here address the variety of locations of the signature facades and gateway elements? It seems to me requirements for the signature façade next to Ruby Tucker Parker might need to be different from those within district 2. I have a similar question about the signature façade that abuts Mount Jefferson Park at the south end of the district 2.	Advisory Group	Gateways		The standards do not address this; however, these details will be addressed through the development review process
4	57	Corner of building at southeast corner of intersection of north-south Road and Glebe might want to have a "Signature Facade" or "Gateway Element"	Advisory Group	Gateways	Signature façade added	
4	58	Not sure I understand the difference between gateway elements and signature facades.	Advisory Group	Gateways	Added language to clarify	
4	59	Suggests alternative pedestrian crossing at Raymond and Rt 1; better flow for Lynhaven to metro	Advisory Group	Ped crossing location	The plan has been revised so that a ped crossing can be anywhere between Custis and Glebe	
4	59	You might want to pick a different color for the bike path (or for the plan area outline) as it is a bit visually confusing with the dotted line color outlining the plan area. At first glance I thought the map was showing the plan area outline as a shared bike path.	Advisory Group	Graphics	Addressed	
4	59	I think the park plan shows the bike path leaving Mt. Jefferson Park at this point and continuing along Fannon, leaving the highest portion of the park as pedestrian path only.	Advisory Group	Graphics	Addressed	
4	59	Make sure this graphic is consistent with the Park Concept Plan graphic vis a vis the path and pedestrian/bike use	AlexEngage	Graphics	Addressed	
4	59	Bike Pedestrian Network - There should be a signalized pedestrian only crossing like the planned new one at Fannon Street somewhere north like at the Ruby Tucker Park. The current intersection at Reed is very unsafe with all the turning movements.	AlexEngage	Ped crossing location	The plan has been revised so that a ped crossing can be anywhere between Custis and Glebe	
4	59	I am pretty surprised that there are no dedicated bike lanes on north-south Road and even shocked that there aren't even shared bike lanes on that street. I was even a little surprised that Glebe doesn't have at least planned shared bike lanes. Please explore placing bike accommodations on those streets. <ul style="list-style-type: none">- In continuation of the discussion at the last meeting, I think the signalized pedestrian crossing might better serve the community for metro access, access to mt vernon, access to the potomac yard town center and to oakville if moved from Fannon to Raymond.	Advisory Group	Bicycle facilities	Graphic has been updated ; Bike Lanes have been added to Glebe Road. The possibility of bike lanes will be discussed at the Advisory Group meeting.	
4	60	4.36 Why not have crossing at Raymond Ave instead of Fannon	Advisory Group	Ped crossing location	The plan has been revised so that a ped crossing can be anywhere between Custis and Glebe	
4	48 - 51	My neighbors on Clifford avenue and I strongly oppose the proposed building height. These changes alter the feel of the neighborhood and add traffic, pollution, water run-off, noise, and inconvenience to current residents. This is not the first time we've voiced our strong disagreement, however, our opinions were not reflected in the final draft. Does the city care about its increased revenues and developers profit more than the well being of its current residents? Who would want to live in and in a house next to a 60-, 90-foot tall building? We (Del Ray)s suggest not to approve proposed changes to the current (approved) height levels.	AlexEngage	Building heights		Proposed heights were carefully considered, discussed, and agreed to over many months. All redevelopment projects will be required to provide specified transitions, setbacks and stepbacks in order to ensure compatibility with existing neighborhoods. Also, the heights in Districts 3 and 4 were corrected - they were shown higher in the working draft than they should have been.
4	60	Add standard - "Bike Parking shall be provided on private property, accessible to the public, throughout the plan area. Locations to be determined at time of Development Special Use Permit."	Advisory Group	Bicycle facilities		Bike parking is not provided on private property, but two bike share locations are proposed in the plan area.

Chapter	Page #	Comment	Source	Theme	Response - Incorporated into Plan	Response - Not incorporated into Plan
4	General	<p>Approximately 5 years ago, the Lynhaven Citizens (LCA) and other concerned parties met with the City of Alexandria re: the East Glebe Road and Montrose Avenue intersection. Citizens wanted a traffic light to be installed (like the one at Hume and Mt. Vernon intersection). We were told the City could not afford it. A proposal for the installation of a roundabout was discussed. I along with various neighbors granted the City the right to take some of our land for that purpose. I never received a letter from the City offering an explanation for not following through with the proposal. The Citizens next asked for a pedestrian crossing light and were again told the City could not afford it. However, a pedestrian crossing light was placed on West Glebe Road (not a mile away).</p> <p>Your proposal mentions “street calm.” What is this? How can you enforce it? There are speed bumps, pedestrian crossings/lights/strips and cul-de-sacs already in place in Alexandria. They don’t stop speedsters.</p> <p>Now comes your proposal to place another traffic light at the intersection of Montrose Avenue and Rt. 1. This is simply absurd. Every block within the Potomac Yard address has a traffic light except the proposed intersection. Wouldn’t it be more cost effective to synchronize the pre-existing lights instead of adding another one?</p> <p>As it stands now, the current intersections are blocked (light or no) by careless unconcerned people who only care about themselves during rush hour traffic. God protects the pedestrian trying to cross Rt. 1 because they place his/her life in his hands each time they attempt to cross the street. Another light, speed limit signs and pedestrian crossing strips will not work at the Montrose Avenue and Rt. 1 intersection. What will help in this Lynhaven neighborhood is to change parking from 2 sided to 1 side parking only.</p> <p>I understand that your proposal is not dealing with opening the cul-de-sacs of Wesmond and Evans Lane. However, there is a lot of talk about this. Therefore, I would like to state that I do not wish for that change to take place. A lot of residents meet with City Council for placement of the cul-de-sacs. They were visionaries and could see that there were problems with the speed and number of cars cutting through these neighborhoods. They were not wrong because the volume and speed of cars on these streets (even closed off) have increased greatly since their placement.</p> <p>Expansion of the Ruby Tucker Park would be nice. However, a business formerly “Wagonworks” is located on a corner of the Ruby Tucker Park. The employees of this business are currently using the cul-de-sac, the alleyway at the end of Lynhaven Drive, Lynhaven Drive and Montrose Avenue to park.</p> <p>Many of the employees remain at work until 8:00pm – 9:00pm. This causes a parking problem for the residents. To expand the park and remove the cul-de-sac and the alley parking at Lynhaven Drive will cause more parking woes. Will the employees of the business be granted permission to park across the street in Potomac Yard?</p>	AlexEngage	Wesmond/Evans; Montrose signal/Ruby Tucker/ parking	<p>The Plan does not provide a recommendation to open Wesmond Drive, Evans Lane, or Lynhaven Drive. The map/graphic has been refined/corrected to show that these streets will remain in their existing conditions.</p>	<p>A signal at Montrose helps to improve overall traffic operations including improving conditions at E. Glebe Road and E. Reed Avenue. The signal at Route 1 and Montrose will be combined with traffic calming improvements along Montrose Ave, and a signal at the intersection of Montrose Ave at E. Glebe Road/Ashby Street. The type and location of the traffic calming will be done in consultation with the community.</p> <p>Regarding Ruby Tucker Park expansion: The expansion to the park is anticipated to occur generally at the same time as the adjoining property redevelops. In the event the park expansion occurs prior to redevelopment, access to the adjoining blocks will need to be coordinated with the park expansion.</p> <p>New development will be required to comply with parking requirements as outlined in the Parking Standards for New Development Projects Study (online). Also, neighborhoods can request that a new parking district be established to ensure that commuters don't use the neighborhood for metro/transit parking.</p>
Chapter 5 (pgs 62-82): Character						
5	62	5.2 Any reason not to have a maximum	Advisory Group	Building character	Added language to include maximum	
5	62	5.3 Really? This seems awfully specific given the variety of property lines and building heights.	Advisory Group	Clarification	Provided clarification	
5	62	Add standard - "Townhome buildings shall vary in height, setback, material and color so as to avoid flat architecture" (or something to that affect).	Advisory Group	Building heights	Added	
5	63	5.6 “...exceed 15ft above the maximum...” – so now we are at 115’ at Swann?!	Advisory Group	Building heights		That is a potential option, but would be limited to a small area nad would require approval of a Development Special Use Permit.
5	64	I would strongly recommend staff to review the architectural plans for the Town Center at Beauregard that Cunningham Quill has devised as they work through designing the break-up requirements in height. CQA created a very interesting architectural design with lots of variable building heights to give the impression that the area was "developed overtime" and not all at once (even though it will be). I get the impression the City is trying to do something similar at Oakville and so CQA's design may be a helpful resource.	Advisory Group	Architecture		To be discussed during Advisory Group meeting
5	66	5.10 Required to what? Be Built?	Advisory Group	Clarification	Language clarified in plan	
5	66	Recommendation 5.10 should incorporate language similar to 5.17 with the appropriate height maximums “The building shoulder shall be no taller than 15 feet taller than the existing buildings-homes or a maximum of 45 feet whichever is less”; How do 5.13 and 5.14 relate to one another?	Advisory Group	Clarification	The language has been clarified in plan; one requirement addresses a side yard and the other addresses a rear yard requirement.	
5	66	5.10 Not sure what this last sentence means. Might need to be rephrased.	Advisory Group	Clarification	Language clarified in plan	
5	67	<p>Building Transitions Standards, Section II. Multi-family: The multi-family building transition standards should incorporate a requirement similar to the townhouse requirement 5.16 for a fence or wall within the landscape buffer or setback, though a similar and perhaps more desirable effect could be achieved with trees of ample size and density.</p> <p>Page headers of odd pages in Chapter 5 (June 25 working draft) have Character misspelled.</p>	AlexEngage	Building transitions	Language has been added	
5	69	Would the parking for townhomes in District 4 be able to meet the requirement of 5.19 that access be provided via a rear alley?	Advisory Group	Question		Yes
5	69	5.25 minimum 30 foot depth of habitable space seems very specific. Is this a widely accepted standard?	Advisory Group	Building design	This is a standard but is not in the zoning ordinance; so it's important to include	
5	70	5.33, 4th bullet - What are these (masonry units)? How about 7"x15" or 9"x17"	Advisory Group	Building design		The goal is to have sizes that do not appear as typical "cinder" block units.
5	71	5.39 Not sure why "vertical fenestration" has to be called out as a specific feature. Not sure what this means in the context of modern architectural styles.	Advisory Group	Building design	Added the word "generally"; it's and important standard to include to ensure appropriate building detail.	

Chapter	Page #	Comment	Source	Theme	Response - Incorporated into Plan	Response - Not incorporated into Plan
5	72	Massive brick faced boxes with various bumps and indentations to try unsuccessfully to disguise the largeness and FAR maximization. P 72 "liner townhouses" seem to be homes attached to parking structures in the back side? Can that be healthy?	AlexEngage	Building design		Liner residential uses are a common occurrence. Building construction includes appropriate required protections for the homes
5	73	5.42 - Page 73 - Maybe given the trajectory of growth of carsharing (i.e. Uber, Lyft, etc.) there should be provisions or mention for pick up and drop off or Kiss and Ride pull offs from Route One? Could there be set asides for things like Capital Bikeshare?	AlexEngage	Carshare/Bikeshare		Plan does not recommend cur cuts or pulloffs on Route 1, but there will be space set aside for carsharing and bikesharing established through the development review process
5	75	"The proposed office and hotel buildings..." – or Senior Assisted Living and Care Facility • "...hotel and office ranges from 75 to 100 feet, respectively" – 15ft gateway decoration?	Advisory Group	Senior Assisted Facility		To be discussed during Advisory Group meeting
5	76	5.69 See previous comment on fenestration 5.74 I'm not sure what these types of windows are, but wondering if we need to be this specific?	Advisory Group	Building design	Added "generally"	
5	77	• Specific open porches – not to be closed in	Advisory Group	Building design	Language added	
5	78	5.85 Why not corner entrances if done well	Advisory Group	Building design	Plan text has been revised to include	
5	79	5.88 A max height for the screening? Our 100' building is now easily 110'	Advisory Group	Building heights		The maximum height is for the building; the Zoning Ordinance addresses rooftop screening.
5	82	5.95 - Alley Paving Material - Can you mention that the alley material should be designed for durability? In Lynhaven, we have a lot of issues with really torn up alleyways. It would be nice, and perhaps necessary to sell the new structures, if some of the alleyways were redone to a higher standard especially if they are going to be getting more traffic.	AlexEngage	Alley	Added	
5	82	topic "Rear of Buildings-Alleys-Townhouses." Trees should be mandated, not just added where feasible. Trees are expensive to add, if it is not required developers will avoid adding trees, specifically in the rear of buildings-alleys-townhouses.	AlexEngage	Trees		Tree requirements are included through the development review process
5	84	6.2 Images on this page and the next all look like ground level is higher than 4 feet. I don't think we want to encourage that. Maybe we could find some examples more in the 2-3 foot range.	Advisory Group	Building design	Added language that 2/3ft is desired	
5	General	The envisioned illustrations for these new townhouses and multifamily buildings don't look anything like or seem to fit in with the single family homes and town houses they abut to in the west. I would recommend that they don't look so modern. Encourage porches and materials such as brick and fiber cement siding.	AlexEngage	Architecture/character		The goal of the Plan is not to mandate a style, but rather high quality materials. Brick and fiber siding are permitted for townhouses.
5	General	How will all of this new development affect street parking within the Del Ray neighborhood - especially for visitors to these new multi family buildings. Will they be required to provide guest parking?	AlexEngage	Parking/Del Ray		New development will be required to comply with parking requirements, which do not require guest parking
5	General	More focus on the character elements of retail and maker spaces. This plan should put more emphasis on the question of what we want there and not so much on the what it looks like. Without that, the city risks eliminating important services from our community. The plan makes little mention of the importance of the uses that are there now to our economy and our community.	AlexEngage	Retail/Maker Space	Text has been added to address comment	
Chapter 6 (pgs 84-89): Ground Floor Uses						
6	87	Why not maker spaces ?	Advisory Group	Maker Space	Added maker space on Calvert	
6	89	Sounds like we want garage doors on the main streets where we are prohibiting curb cuts. Need to specify that garage doors open from the "C" streets along the back.	Advisory Group	Clarification	Added language	
6	General	Loading – for multifamily and commercial – standards need to be included	Advisory Group	Loading	Added language; loading requirements are addressed through the development review process	
6	General	Sidewalks: allowance for out-door dining should be incorporated (Calvert – review to ensure enough outdoor dining)	Advisory Group	Sidewalks		Will be addressed through the Special Use Permit process
6	General	Signage: A-frame task force/ see Mt. Vernon Ave plan; allow special menu signs in the window	Advisory Group	Signage	Added general language	
6	General	The plan suggests that it will be implemented over decades, not years. That's good because there is a huge surplus of retail space in Del Ray and the immediate vicinity at the moment, with more coming when the rail yard development is complete.	AlexEngage	Retail		The Retail Study conducted during the planning process indicated unmet demand now and with new development (see appendix).

Chapter	Page #	Comment	Source	Theme	Response - Incorporated into Plan	Response - Not incorporated into Plan
6	General	Retail and maker spaces require customer parking, loading facilities, designated space for trash and recycling. Sharing of this limited space with residents is unrealistic for a retail establishment to thrive. The arrangement is impossible for light industrial/commercial use (makers). I would eliminate the need for residential development above ground floor uses for more flexibility.	AlexEngage	Maker space	Buildings will be required to address these requirements in Development Special Use Permit process. Language has been added to standards.	
6	General	The stated standards and guidelines seem reasonable.	AlexEngage			
6	General	Looks good.	AlexEngage	General Support	NA	
6	General	Too many to list here.	AlexEngage			
6	General	Basically driving out existing "maker" businesses by switching to more costly smaller spaces. Where could the existing businesses continue to operate while the construction is going on?	AlexEngage			The Plan will take approximately 20 years to develop and many of the existing uses/buildings will continue; however, as redevelopment happens space will be designed to not preclude the types of existing businesses in the plan area.
6	General	6B. The secondary retail is along Oakville St., not Swann. Swann is basically an alley - no one is going to want to walk there. 6C Maker space should run along the east side of North South Rd. as opposed to along the highway. People don't want to walk along a highway if they can avoid it. I'm not keen on having maker space in District 4 because it will be hard to get in and out of. Maybe put your low income housing here (limited parking).	AlexEngage	Maker		Swann is the primary retail street. Calvert and Oakville are the secondary retail/maker space streets. Maker space can be any part of the ground floor in the blocks designated for maker and the graphic has been revised for Oakville Street.
Chapter 7 (pgs 92-98): Signage						
7	95	SIGNAGE Window Sign. Professionally painted and gold-leaf individual letters are (or should be) a thing of the past. In this modern era, Window signage is typically cut or printed vinyl letters and graphics and is applied to the outside of the glass (not inside) for better visibility. Page 97, Section 8.20 says flat signs are allowed. Section 8.31 says flat panel signs are prohibited. What is the difference between a flat sign and a flat panel sign? Please clarify better.	AlexEngage	Signs	Edited for clarification	
7	96	8.2 Do we have to follow the sign ordinance here? If so, it's pretty hard to have two signs within that. It's pretty limiting.	Advisory Group	Signs	Added general language regarding the process	
7	96	We should incorporate some of the considerations of the Ad Hoc workgroup on A-Frame & Digital Signs. In particular, the generalization of the menu sign used by restaurants, i.e., allow a daily special sign in the window	Advisory Group	Signs	Added general language regarding the process	
7	General	Do these make it easier or harder to get a sign approved by city hall?	AlexEngage	Signs	Added clarification about the process and how the design standards fit.	
7	General	Looks good.	AlexEngage	General Support	NA	
7	General	The stated standards and guidelines seem reasonable.	AlexEngage			
Chapter 8 (pgs 100-111): Streets						
8	100	The map on pg 100 indicates that both Wesmond and Evans streets will go through to Rt 1 with the new developments. I am STRONGLY opposed to those becoming through streets. There is already traffic going much too fast on Montrose that cuts through our neighborhood. With the street parking it is very difficult to see oncoming traffic to begin with. And I already feel slightly unsafe crossing Montrose with my family. Additional through traffic would certainly compromise the safety of my family and our neighbors. Please DO NOT make Wesmond and Evans through streets.	AlexEngage	Wesmond/Evans		The Plan does not provide a recommendation to open Wesmond Drive, Evans Lane, or Lynhaven Drive. The map/graphic has been refined/corrected to show that these streets will remain in their existing conditions.
8	100	Although it is not specifically called out in the text, the map would suggest that Evans and Wesmond are to be reconfigured to open onto Route 1. This would significantly increase the amount of thru traffic in the Lynhaven neighborhood, and I see no benefit or added value to the community. A smarter plan would perhaps be to simply make those connections more pedestrian and bicycle friendly, but still prohibit vehicular traffic.	AlexEngage	Wesmond/Evans		The Plan does not provide a recommendation to open Wesmond Drive, Evans Lane, or Lynhaven Drive. The map/graphic has been refined/corrected to show that these streets will remain in their existing conditions.
8	100	The map on Page 100 show Evans Lane and Wesmond Drive open to Rt 1. These streets are currently closed off to Rt 1, and reopening them would have an enormous negative impact on the Lynhaven neighborhood as far as increasing cut-through traffic (which is already a problem on Montrose). I strongly oppose opening Evans Lane and Wesmond Drive to Rt 1, and this huge change seems to be buried in the plans.	AlexEngage	Wesmond/Evans		The Plan does not provide a recommendation to open Wesmond Drive, Evans Lane, or Lynhaven Drive. The map/graphic has been refined/corrected to show that these streets will remain in their existing conditions.

Chapter	Page #	Comment	Source	Theme	Response - Incorporated into Plan	Response - Not incorporated into Plan
8	100	Although it is not specifically called out in the text, the map would suggest that Evans and Wesmond are to be reconfigured to open onto Route 1. This would significantly increase the amount of thru traffic in the Lynhaven neighborhood, one with an increasing amount of small children (including my own), and I see no benefit or added value to the community. A smarter plan would perhaps be to simply make those connections more pedestrian and bicycle friendly, but still prohibit vehicular traffic. Opening those up to the large amount of traffic on Route 1 would encourage more pass-through traffic, especially during commuting hours. Very strongly opposed.	AlexEngage	Wesmond/Evans		The Plan does not provide a recommendation to open Wesmond Drive, Evans Lane, or Lynhaven Drive. The map/graphic has been refined/corrected to show that these streets will remain in their existing conditions.
8	101	Typo. This should read "Route 1 Streetscape - Commercial Uses" Also, which part of Potomac Yard is this? Should the Potomac Yard side be a townhouse or is it one of the taller buildings?	Advisory Group	Non-substantive edit	Addressed	
8	102	Again, not sure what part of Potomac Yard this is.	Advisory Group	Graphics	Addressed	
8	103	Shouldn't we show the proposed building on south side of Fannon instead of existing?	Advisory Group	Graphics	Not known at the time of the Plan draft; will address	
8	104	Can we identify this as bike/ped trail?	Advisory Group	Graphics	Addressed	
8	105	Concerned about clarity of public widths vs. private widths	Advisory Group	Graphics		Outdoor dining and other encroachments will be addressed in future Special Use Permits
8	105	Need to show specific space for bike lane, maybe with a bicyclist to make it clear.	Advisory Group	Graphics	Addressed	
8	107	I would strongly suggest staff explore the ability to place dedicated bike lanes on the north-south road. At the very least, shared lanes should be incorporated. Perhaps hold 14' for the streetscape (in lieu of 16'), reduce the travel lanes to 11' (in lieu of 12') and encroach into the buildable area by 2' on each side to obtain a total of (2) 5' wide dedicated bike lanes.	Advisory Group	Bicycle facilities		To be discussed during Advisory Group meeting
8	108	Maybe identify as "Existing Commercial" so people don't think it's a little house that's going to be dwarfed by the taller residential across the street. Or put in the allowed height of 30'	Advisory Group	Non-substantive edit	Incorporated	
8	109	"Existing Commercial", or put in the allowed new height that's on the plan.	Advisory Group	Non-substantive edit	Incorporated	
8	General	I would like to see the plan outline what is covered in the East Glebe/Route 1 intersection phases and what triggers are included for these improvements.	Advisory Group	Route 1/East Glebe		Summary provided in Ch. 1 and Ch 3 Framework. Triggers will be in the staff report and Development Special Use Permit.
8	General	AVENUE vs STREET Throughout this whole process, Calvert Avenue and Swann Avenue have frequently been mislabeled as Calvert Street and Swann Street. This error continues throughout this document and should be corrected. I have noticed this error in the following pages: Pg. 4, Table of Contents section F. Calvert St. should be changed to Calvert Ave. Pg. 15. Section 1.9 Swann Street should be changed to Swann Ave. Pg. 30. Calvert Ave is listed as Calvert Street twice. Pg. 31. Calvert Ave is listed as Calvert Street Pgs. 108 and 109. Calvert Ave is listed as Calvert Street	AlexEngage	Non-substantive edit	Addressed	
8	General	I reiterate my intense opposition to what appears to be the Plan's recommendation to open Wesmond Dr. and Evans Ln. (pp. 39, 100). While I appreciate that the proposal for Swann Ave. (p. 105) has a bicycle lane, a single street having that amenity in a proposed development in 2015 especially considering the efforts DC has put into adding bike lanes to existing streets seems inadequate.	AlexEngage	Wesmond/Evans		The Plan does not provide a recommendation to open Wesmond Drive, Evans Lane, or Lynhaven Drive. The map/graphic has been refined/corrected to show that these streets will remain in their existing conditions.
8	General	The questions is raised that on page 49 and 100 Wesmond and Evans is shown to be reopened at Route 1. If this is true there will be undue burden of traffic on small streets when better streets for traffic flow are a block away. This will hinder the flow of traffic with multiple intersections along busy Route 1. And this will completely void any buffer between Route 1 from this residential area. I am opposed to opening Wesmond and Evans to Route 1.	AlexEngage	Wesmond/Evans		The Plan does not provide a recommendation to open Wesmond Drive, Evans Lane, or Lynhaven Drive. The map/graphic has been refined/corrected to show that these streets will remain in their existing conditions.
8	General	Parking is a worry of mine. If these areas become busy is the overflow going to come in to the del ray neighborhood? Would we start permit parking for the streets around the development to keep spots for residents?	AlexEngage	Parking		Neighborhoods can request that a new parking district be established to ensure that commuters don't use the neighborhood for metro/transit parking.
8	General	Separate bike lanes on route 1.	AlexEngage	Bicycle facilities		The Plan is not proposing bike lanes on Route 1.

Chapter	Page #	Comment	Source	Theme	Response - Incorporated into Plan	Response - Not incorporated into Plan
8	General	I'm concerned that the implications of the opening of Evans and/or Wesmond. While not explicitly stated out in the plan, page 100 shows a street map with Evans and Wesmond open to Route 1. Page 111, shows the streets to be re-configured to intersect with Route 1. There is documented evidence that would suggest this is not only a potential cause for increased congestion but may also increase traffic accidents and fatalities. In 2006, the US Department of Transportation, Turner-Fairbank Highway Research Center general stated, Intersection-related crashes make up 21% of all fatal crashes (HRT-08-025). This is completely understandable and well documented and explained in traffic flow theory. Generally, the increase in intersections (that would be the new Evans and/or Wesmond intersections) could increase congestion and pose potential safety concerns. Only well planned and modeled intersections (to allow long sections on gently curving roads at graded intersections while vehicles can often move across lanes without causing significant interference to the flow) may prove such a undertaking advisable. However, Modeling takes time. These type intersections are expensive and take up a large amount of land. Synchronization of lights by intelligent systems might reduce accidents but would likely increase congestion - again this would require study. Questions: Has the City conducted a simulation of the opening of Evans and/or Wesmond? Have they worked with Systems Dynamics Models or such models as Kerner's / or classic traffic flow models? If so, I'd like to examine the results â€" even better, has a traffic flow study been posted for ALL to review in the spirit of transparency? I have examined such studies in the past and they are very enlightening. Thank you	AlexEngage	Wesmond/Evans		The Plan does not provide a recommendation to open Wesmond Drive, Evans Lane, or Lynhaven Drive. The map/graphic has been refined/corrected to show that these streets will remain in their existing conditions.
8	General	We've heard a lot about "connectivity" in the public outreach surrounding the Oakville development, but the only actions taken to date have reduced connectivity for Del Ray by eliminating the ability of motorists on Raymond and Hume cross Route 1. This was done in order to make room for a bus lane that is usually empty and, in the rare occasion a bus is using the extra lanes, the bus itself is empty. Good work. These bus lanes have hurt the "walkability" factor as well. What pedestrian is going to enjoy crossing a 50-yard concrete barrier between the east and west sides of Route 1? It really will serve to divide the community into two halves. Meanwhile, the setbacks on the east side of the road are so small, pedestrians are effectively trapped between the sheer walls of the new development and the heavily traveled Route 1. Let's hope the larger setbacks envisioned for the west side of the road are preserved. Finally, the visuals for the proposed streets only serve to remind the reader that this development has no aesthetic connection whatsoever to Del Ray. It is a high-density development that fits with the rest of the high density development around Route 1. Finally, let's all thank the planning commission, etc, for the massive new influx of commuters headed our way when the rail yard development is complete! Nothing like adding 10-15 minutes to your commute everyday so Alexandria can max out on its tax collections.	AlexEngage	Transportation		The Plan incorporates streetscape and wayfinding requirements for the plan area.
8	General	A. Park Rd. You have the parking on the wrong side. This is going to be high-end townhouses with garages. The parking has to be on the park side of the street to allow for all the curb cuts to provide access to the garages. As a plus you will have many more spaces available for visitors to the park or residences. B. Oakville St. No on-street parking! Have we not learned enough from King St.? (I wish you could get away with having no cars at all on this road but ultimately that won't work) Replace the on-street parking with bike lanes. Also this road doesn't need to be 24' wide. C. The Glebe Rd. configuration isn't going to work. There will be too much demand and not enough space to operate - you won't be able to get from north-south Rd. to the left turn lanes. Sorry this is hard to describe in prose but I'll try to explain what I'm proposing. 1. Extend north-south Road across Glebe to the base of Wesmond. Keep the existing barrier between Wesmond and Rt. 1. (You will have to completely rethink what you want to do with block 17.) 2. Drivers going north on N-S can only go straight at Glebe (no turns). The street grid offers alternatives to those who want to end up on Glebe. 3. Put a signal at N-S and Rt. 1 (left turn only). Forget about the one for Montrose. 4. Going east on Glebe you can only turn right or straight at Rt 1. If you want to go North, turn left onto N-S or better yet, take Commonwealth to Reed. 5. No right turns onto Glebe from Rt. 1 - you have to turn right at north-south. If you miss that turn, you can weave through Oakville Triangle. 6. You'll need to make extra sure that those on Glebe don't "block the box" at north-south.	AlexEngage	Parking/Transportation/Connectivity		A. Park Road: Garage access to Townhouses will be from rear. Street parking in front of townhouses to preserve views/access to park B. Bike lanes are not proposed along the north-south road because the planned north-south bicycle route within this vicinity is along the trail adjacent Potomac Ave., which provides a better, more continuous facility. C. The project will be developed in two phases as development opportunity arises, and our analysis is showing that the phasing of the project will be adequate to support the traffic needs at this intersection. The intersection of the new north-south road will include a signal at E. Glebe Rd to improve operations. In addition to this improvement, other projects to improve mobility are being recommended, including a signal at Route 1 and Montrose Ave. 1. The boundary of the plan area, including the plan area north of East Glebe Road, prohibits the proposed north-south road from extending across E. Glebe Road to the north. In addition, any extension north of E. Glebe Road would impact the existing residential units along Wesmond Dr that are proposed to stay. 2. The plan allows for vehicles traversing north on the proposed north-south road to be able to turn east onto E. Glebe Road. A signal would be located at this intersection. 3. The Plan does not assume that the north-south road will intersect with Route 1. The north-south road terminates at E. Glebe Rd. A signal at Montrose helps to improve overall traffic operations including improving conditions at E. Glebe Road, and at E. Reed Ave. The signal at Route 1 at Montrose will be combined with traffic calming improvements along Montrose Avenue, and a signal at the intersection of Montrose Avenue at E. Glebe Road/Ashby Street. 4/5 The proposed improvement at the intersection of Route 1 and Glebe will include an eastbound left turn lane (to allow traffic to go north onto Route 1), a through lane, and a right turn lane. The north-south road is not proposed to intersect with Route 1. 6. Comment noted. A signal is proposed at the intersection of the north-south road at E. Glebe. This will be an enforcement issue.
Chapter 9 (pgs 114-127): Recommendations						
9	General	We love our dogs in Del Ray, please don't make us drive to Shirlington to use a decent dog park as Mount Jefferson park is the main dog park in Del Ray.	AlexEngage	Dog park		The dog exercise area in Mount Jefferson Park will remain
9	General	It is unclear whether or not there are plans to open Wesmond Dr and/or Evans Ln to through traffic. This is a terrible idea that the community is very strongly opposed to. This would create an atmosphere that would be inhospitable to the community and dangerous to the many young families and pet owners who live in the neighborhood.	AlexEngage	Wesmond/Evans		The Plan does not provide a recommendation to open Wesmond Drive, Evans Lane, or Lynhaven Drive. The map/graphic has been refined/corrected to show that these streets will remain in their existing conditions.
9	General	Do not see anything on using any green criteria, like LEED certification, or living buildings, or passive house. Remember Eco City goals? Also metro as a whole is struggling and very unclear that it can handle a big additional load.	AlexEngage	Green Buildings	Added compliance with existing City standards, plan and policies to beginning of Plans and Standards	

Chapter	Page #	Comment	Source	Theme	Response - Incorporated into Plan	Response - Not incorporated into Plan
9	General	We (Del Ray) suggest not to approve proposed changes to the current (approved) height levels.	AlexEngage	Building heights/neighborhood compatibility		Proposed heights were carefully considered, discussed, and agreed to over many months. All redevelopment projects will be required to provide specified transitions, setbacks and stepbacks in order to ensure compatibility with existing neighborhoods.
9	General	Bottom Line Up Front. This should be the beginning of the document, not the end. Most readers will only want to see this summary and maybe look up a specific section. I didn't even know this existed until I was done wading through the other 100 pages. You have the Chapter 7 recommendations listed as Chapter 8.	AlexEngage	Non-substantive edit	In final revision, can consider moving recommendations to front. Chapter 7 has been revised.	